

Into Space Between...

Adam Fieled



Preface

The precepts and lexicon introduced in “Space Between: A New Gestalt Approach to Ontology and Aesthetics” laid the groundwork for many potential explorations and exertions. The most salient one, for/to me, involved praxis: how the lexicon might be practically applied both to the respective histories of ontology and aesthetics and to the zeitgeist, as it reigns over the West in the early twenty-first century. So, in composing the miniaturized discourses which comprise “In Space Between,” I have tried to manifest praxis around this new lexicon, which will enable it to be of concrete benefit to as many engaged and scrupulous intellects as possible.

On the Relevance of Space Between, the Meta-Rational in 2013

The way the system and systematic terms of “Space Between...” relate to the “daily” and daily life, as a site for pragmatic application— that Space Between must interact variously with various temperaments, as must the approach to meta-rationality— but that all terms become consolidated in interrogations of individuality, subject-hood and subjectivity, and interrogations also of the dialects and constituent linguistic signs which constitute the cognitive forms of subject-hood and subjectivity— not merely an immersion in textuality but self-contained, self-subsistent meditation— vigilant, scrupulous pursuit of “souled” consciousness in sustaining silence— a mode of rebellion against the cacophonous, Americanized materialism of the twentieth century— the pity and terror of the twentieth century’s fall-out affecting a catharsis (“lived” tragedy) for ontologically “shell-shocked” individuals, not to aestheticize consciousness but to cleanse it.

For those in the West, consciousness must rebel against the Victorian constraints of middle-class morality, and the strictly materially “productive”— the shackles of a perceived inner necessity to produce must be loosened (and Space Between instated) because channels of production (base/superstructure conjunctions) have been blocked or broken, and facets of the material become inaccessible— ontological, cognitive “production” (consciousness clearing Space Between for itself (in-itself), self-generating levels of Dasein, the cognitive producing a novel sense of the cognitive for itself to manifest a schema of objective clarity where subjectivity and subject-hood are concerned) must become a priority and the inward be awarded pride of place. Competitive instincts in 2013 are being thwarted on all sides, world and will torqued into a formidably imposing façade, so that the many undermining the few have become a drastic syndrome (sub-plague), and the idea of a self-propelled, equitably maintained middle class dwindled into a miasma of unacknowledged deaths and extreme degenerative torpor, “decoyed” by an inarticulate and incomprehensible media.

As to why the single antidote for “extreme degenerative torpor” could be the cultivation of “souled” consciousness, ontological awareness, Space Between/Dasein, awareness of the meta-rational in oppositions to the constraints of difference— the only potentiality for substantial growth is spiritual; and if individuals avail themselves of ontological awareness (“purified” consciousness-in-itself), America may finally progress from adolescence into adulthood. Ontology as a palliative for various signifiers of duplicity, manifestations of imperatives to “decoy”— the media’s, government’s, art business’s, entertainment industry’s reliance on a communistic stance that individuals may easily be replaced/replicated, and that the submersion by which “replicants” consolidate their position is neither noticeable or important. “Souled” consciousness is the enemy of the communistic streak in high-sector America, our hinge to national/international duplicity which makes high-sector America a site of/for pitch-blackness, against actively pursued ontological awareness, the meta-rational, Space Between. This applies also to the American academy.

The fundamental disjuncture between ontological awareness, the meta-rational, and parataxis— the meta-rational, within ontological awareness, imposes the gracefulness of permanent and durable connections, connectivity, connective tissue— within, even, the confines of self-schemas. America has been a society tormented by parataxis, imposed by the

atomization of selves, who cannot connect except as reciprocal goads to material competition, miring America in an eternal present, “against” history, and history’s (formal rigor’s) interrelationship (as both potentiality and reality) with ontology, as thought-discipline and (more pertinently, and egregiously, against the will’s facility in the “New Age”) spiritual practice. Because ontology interrogates atomization and individuality, it is the enemy of ideologies which prefer individuals to remain atomized— a capitalistic society where high sectors evince the duplicity of communism in its most brutish and inhumane forms manifests a collective ideology “against” ontology, but which is now dissolving under the weight of a spendthrift praxis over a substantial duration, in an entropic economic context.

How ontological awareness, the meta-rational, Space Between connect to material reality— they impose a second value-system against the primacy of material values— for the “souled,” they constitute a primary mode on the Purification Chain, enacting a reciprocal relationship with materiality (secondary mode) designated to create conditions for the manifestation of consciousness working towards purity of perception (within/without Kant’s lightning bolt, Derrida’s lightning bolt within it, of language), even as continual processes (the “daily”) necessitate imperfection and constant re-valuation. Ontology and “souled” consciousness are a realm and pursuit of democratic spirit, and invert the values and value systems of decoyed facades and drug dealing— ontological pursuits “elevate” through labor and “earned” states of objective clarity, against the perfidious “buzz” produced by intoxicants, which block cognition and constrict Space Between.

Adam Fieled, 2013

Moral and Ethical Imperatives in Relation to the Meta-Rational

If there is a moral or ethical imperative issuing from the meta-rational and meta-rationality, it has to do with possibilities of connection— that monads, singles, substances can act on each other in such a way as to suggest that wills can impose on wills, minds impose on minds, and souls can impose on souls (in structures and contexts where “soul” is an issue); points of balance must (with the imperative of individualized will behind it) forge their link by imposition, for the most part, amid the largely soulless detritus of the human landscape; and the moral and ethical imperative of meta-rationality as only subsistent for the “souled,” those whose consciousness includes a thorough and individualized investigation, starting from the “I,” of subjects and subjectivity. With nuance and detail excluded from human consciousness in regards to individuation, the principle of sufficient reason, difference, etc, most links and points of balance will point into the trough of empty empiricism, materiality, and endless conflict of wills in search of the non-existent “soul” of material power and consonance, employing the empirical as a weapon and means of imposition.

As for the cultivation of meta-rationality leading to the cultivation of the soul— to view the balancing links which construct the human soul out of collective and personal histories (modes of formal rigor)— one site for this is major high art consonance, and aesthetics— where forces of balance and “linkage” assume the most comely and compelling forms, appealing to the human will (its affect, its aliveness) with a form and function beyond it— and the pity and terror which dwell within it— properly executed, major high art consonance is a prime and primal vessel for the perpetuation “towards soul” of the human race and its collective consciousness (and collective unconscious), and towards the meta-rational, in its ideal and representative forms.

As for a moral and ethical imperative within the aesthetic, and towards meta-rationality— the only proper moral and ethical imperative within the aesthetic is the pursuit of symbolization both precise and complex, as manifestation of the truth of world and earth, will and idea together and as represented in a compressed matrix so as to affect a catharsis for its audience, so that the meta-rational potentiality for “linkage” be posited against the will’s facility and its simple, crass levels of symbolization meant to link and balance wills in affirmation of the subsistence of world and will as primary modes, against their potential purification by earth and idea.

On the level of “personality” and personal life, those linked “by soul” are most likely to employ the meta-rational in its correct guise; a kind of “geist” or spirit to enable respect, consideration, and moral/ethical scrupulosity in relation to “action” and forms of being-in-the-world; all towards the verticality of balance and links; for those linked by the empty, unexamined empiricism of material interests, the links of meta-rationality burrow “beneath the earth,” to reinforce the submersion of examined individuation into collectives which express, in crass terms, the will’s facility, competition and imperatives to impose and dominate.

The moral/ethical imperative for the “souled” is halved— for the maintenance of a soul, which takes its essence from a thorough and personal evaluation of individuation, requires

sacrifices against empiricism and material interest, towards continual introspection and the favoring of earth and idea over world and will; so that engagement in world and will must be moderated and disciplined against; while, for the benefit of the human race, the “souled” must engage, and there is a moral/ethical imperative to do so, and the sacrifice to engage must be made as well; in a largely soulless landscape, everything the “souled” accomplish or experience must have some element of sacrifice built into it; even if some of the sacrifices are made towards individuation, some against; and, as everything in a souled consciousness must make an attempt to balance the meta-rational and its perspectives, linkage must be established between methods/modes of sacrifice.

It is taken for granted that, in the context of the moral/ethical imperatives built into meta-rationality, no soul is perfect, and the soul is not perfectible, or perfectly balanced; thus, most sacrifices will push the soul too far into either engagement with or disengagement from world and will, in the context of the political, the aesthetic, etc; the continual process of specific, personal individuation necessitates a conception of the ideal, and an ideal state of personal, individuated balance; verticality within the context of the meta-rational is always an ideal; and one moral/ethical imperative for the souled is to maintain awareness of the ideal, its formal rigor and connections to history, as a continual horizon against descents into totalized confusion and its links downwards into despair “against” examined levels of individuation.

Adam Fieled, 2013

On Mortality and the Meta-Rational

Linguists (specifically, N. Chomsky) have noted that language holds and represents the possibility for an infinity, an infinite number of sentences. Sentences can fulfill the functional necessity of objects-in-time and numbers-in-space; what is also infinite in language is the possibility of meta-rational “linkage” and “balance” between spheres and regions of ideation and ideational constructs; thus, the meta-rational also holds and represents, through its engagement with and “in” language, the possibility for an infinity, an infinite number of balancing links. Having engendered a demonstrable infinity, it is reasonable that human consciousness, however limited by space/time constraints and the mortality of the phenomenal, partakes, in its ideal form, (especially when “souled” by a connection to and interest in individuation and its self-enclosed processes, within Dasein), in and of the infinite.

Interrogations of mortality must, of necessity, come to indeterminate conclusions, if properly scrupulous— but souls who connect, through volitional agency, intelligence, and the possibilities of meta-rational consciousness, to the infinite, may create conditions related to Space Between which continues their consciousness once they no longer exist phenomenally on earth. This is demonstrably and empirically a possibility. What subsists in language also subsists in numbers and number sequences; possibilities of progressions into Space Between. That Dasein, properly sculpted “into” consciousness, does not need to be “woven out” once the body vanishes, if “links” are fastened to the infinite, is admissible.

As to whether ontology would be a worthwhile sphere of thought if no continuation of consciousness were possible past physical death— because, through language and numbers, human consciousness has a hinge to cognitive sectors which demonstrate a “halved” quality between materiality (phenomenal subsistence) and purely against the merely material (agents of “pure reason,” representations of Space Between against space/time limitations as a priori, fixed intuitions)— once the individual “souled” consciousness begins the process of defining, in language, its individuation with and against the infinite, physical death and its requisite casualty of human will (will-to-power, will-to-compete) may not be a salient concern if meta-rationality and its possibilities are internalized. Language is itself “halved”— frail on one side (in the arbitrary nature of the signifier lamented by the Deconstructionists), sturdy on the other (in the potentiality for an infinite number of sentences representing an infinite number of intuitions, conceptions, and understandings and granted potency by the grace of the meta-rational in human consciousness).

Here is the mistake made by the Deconstructionists— the fallacy that the arbitrary nature of the signifier cuts it (and language, what signifies) off from all gracefulness and states of grace; that language can be endowed with grace by the precision of human cognitions, and be made graceful in its structures and its manners of structural expression, in representing cognitive and affective realities, is not only salient to remember but so hewn into philosophical (especially ontological) discourse that if sentences could not be “graced” or graceful, no discourse would be possible, or let alone as “deathless” as the most potent discourses are; and that what subsists as “deathless,” past the Romanticism of the aesthetic into pure a priori perpetual possibility, in human consciousness need not be perceived as “omnipotent”; frailty does not cut off the majestic (as in Kant’s “mechanical majestic”); and that the circle

of viable discourses makes meta-rationality manifestation of human “souled” consciousness above the vagaries of the merely phenomenal.

Adam Fieled, 2013

Notes on Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, Pt. 1: "Earth-into-Idea"

Kant in relation to human emotions, and to the condition of the thing-in-itself relating to "attachment," in the crass sense, to a body, the condition of "having" a body, and to the phenomenal character of the body in relation to the interior life of the noumena— that the thing-in-itself is already a self-inhering "double" means that "thing-in-itself" has no creative or demonstrative power outside its quality as a "halved," self-enclosed entity.

Kant in relation to an interrogated language, and how the language stands as representation of the mechanics of "pure reason"; the materiality of language as object-in-time and, in its palpable manifestations, numbers-in-space, creates a barrier between Kant and his discursive spine; an assumed sense of the meta-rational, which allows a direct "linkage" between what Kant wants to represent linguistically and his ability to do so. However, whether Kant's pure reason discourse amounts to a "pure transmission," with linguistic signs transparently representing the mechanics of his conceptions, and whether language is equipped to represent reason in its pure sense, is debatable.

What is the language of "pure reason"? How is the language of "pure reason" structured? How are "space" and "time," as pure or empirical intuitions, represented by language, and how much transparency is language capable of in representing categories and categorical imperatives? Kant's language has in it a "ripple effect" of concentric rings emanating from his conceptions, page by page in "Critique of Pure Reason"; but that language is an object, filling space, while also attaining to the unknowable singularity of the thing-in-itself, moves the space "around" Kant's discourse into uneasy relations with the tenets of Deconstructionism, and the arbitrary nature of the signifier. Kant is a luminescent mechanic using tools less luminescent than his own mind.

How Kant's Critique cleans itself of contradiction by sticking to the mechanics of perception; and yet the possibility of living a "mechanical" life is not a fertile horizon for the human species; what we can know and what we may not know (epistemology) is always conditioned by the affective state of our consciousness and of our bodies; and our knowledge is transmitted, sometimes through numbers-in-space, sometimes through language; for the empiricism of every expression but the mechanical, which constitutes the majority of human expressions, Kant's Critique must clean itself of its own cleanliness into an interrogation of language, affect, and the body in both generalized and specific terms; thus, Kant's Critique and "the soul" would find fruitful interaction in dialectic reasoning, against the "pure" and into the pure ground of earth-into-idea.

Adam Fieled, 2013

Notes on Kant's Critique of Pure Reason and the Purification Chain

Earth-into-Idea— a sense of meta-rational possibility from the “mechanical majestic,” in reference to the purely cognitive, into the affective— how and why a priori intuitions, as a primary mode, can be purified by the secondary mode of “the soul” (as one possible constituent level of human consciousness), its own intuitive sense of space and time (as registered not only by cognition but by affect) in reference to the absolute empirical condition of individuation. In other words, a “soul” is situated within a space between which must take Kant’s formulations as also Space Between, in some ways “against” it, a primary mode to its secondary mode but one half-denied by an essence of examined data pertaining to individuation nonetheless, which is halved in itself by the dictates of time and space as a priori intuitions. What the soul knows it knows “past” a priori intuitions, into a posteriori intuitions, chosen representations of formal earth-into-idea.

What acknowledged individual and individualized will can do (for already-individuated “souls”) to purify (for itself and others, in text) the primary modes of Kant’s idea, Ideas, or Ideals— express the cognitive-affective conditions of individuation in such a way that the possibility of cognitive “purity” and pure reason is represented as precisely as possible within the context of linguistic expression, in the interstices where will can be tamed, lulled, mortified, or charmed into evincing characteristics of “soul,” linked by meta-rationality from the a posteriori to the a priori against the merely mechanical: a site for responses and responsiveness, the necessary empirical against which Kant’s formulations must subsist.

Why Space Between is what connects Kant with the Purification Chain— the fact that Kant’s formulations are “air-tight” in their precision “around” the issue of individuality-within-reason (an adjunct conception to earth-into-idea, and a half-analogue to the principle of sufficient reason, difference, etc), how it must account for the beyond-mechanical (meta-rational) Space Between in human consciousness, and that the correlative secondary mode to Kant’s primary mode (which is necessarily a site for greater formal rigor of conception) has its own a priori intuitive structure in relation to the impersonal mechanisms which determine our empirical existences as noumena and phenomenon in space and time.

Adam Fieled, 2013

Notes on Nietzsche in Relation to Space Between and the Meta-Rational

Nietzsche reacts to an “antiseptic” society, numbed by Christian piety into a lack of awareness of its own lambasted and disowned instincts. What would Nietzsche say about twentieth century America, which (in its higher, “controlling” sectors) lurched forward by its mechanism of “all instinct,” but instinct in its most crass, strong-stomach-and-iron-willed towards material progress and dominion form? This is a milieu in which, just by dint of sensitive and nuanced cognition, Nietzsche himself becomes a Christian and (owing to the extremity of his vision’s breadth and positivity) a saint. Twentieth century America, in other words, turned Nietzsche on his head (as much or more than the Nazis did) by “out-willing” him, manifesting “killer instincts” so far removed from pity (but also from intellection) that it is difficult to imagine a Nietzsche who could condone a culture so steeped in amorality and immorality, and brutish in its will to material, “apparent” power.

Nietzsche’s profound moral center: that he bothered to care (against Schopenhauer) for the possibilities and fate of the human race, and that the excesses of his intellectual depth (or depths) made the meta-rational link from the Greek spirit of the Dionysian to its use as palliative against Christian piety and idolatry— but, twentieth century America took the Dionysian to its farthest extreme by espousing the orgiastic against intellection— Nietzsche never stipulates that his conception of will should eschew “idea” and pure ideality completely— his own self-contained discourses (its self-denied and denying dialectics) did not (could not, in a self-respecting manner) disavow high levels of subtlety and artifice— the America of no-subtlety and no-artifice made of discourse (usually institutionalized) a necessary repository for saintliness— even, broadly speaking, the process of “reading” became a repository for formalist and baroque or simple “religiosity,” a caricature of Nietzschean “instincts” and heroic anti-morality— we know what Nietzsche made of European clerics and clerisy— what would he have made of American con artists, drug dealing pimps, and self-proclaimed uber-mensch demagogues, with or against its Academy?

The American anti-clerisy of the twentieth century were certainly “clean” of morality, and beyond notions of moral good and evil— but the twenty-first century is a new context, and (willy-nilly) in many ways the twentieth century was Nietzsche’s— the acknowledgement of Space Between, its hinge to the possibilities of the meta-rational (“linkage,” vertical movement of the “souled,” both by instinct and intellection) negates the first context in an American dialectic of centuries— possibly, even, the next century will enact a kind of synthesis (the twenty-second century)— but no American who cares about the “health” of instincts can take Nietzsche’s conceptions seriously in 2013. Nietzsche’s sloppiness, his lack of practical insight (what does the uber-mensch rise from his sleep every morning and *do?*), and his own will’s facility in textually extending his rhetorical positions with the florid grandiosity of a mad adolescent centaur firing off arrows in all directions.

One inversion to stipulate about twentieth century America— Europeans attributed to it extraordinary brutishness, in its crass consumerist materialism— this is true— but it is also true, that in its political and commercial duplicity, its evasions, decoys, and fraudulent appearances, America displayed greatly cunning subtlety. America, in other words, did manifest intellection, but it was misplaced into channels whose *telos* was material profit for its

own sake. Strictly speaking, high sector America told the truth about nothing— everything and everyone was fair game to be decoyed. Twentieth century America's will to power was not solely one-dimensional and naïve; European intellectuals who interpreted it that way were cruelly deceived. Yet, on both levels (overt and covert) American will to power was diseased with unclean and unhealthy instincts— amorality and immorality taken to such extremes as (this bears repeating) to make a saint of Nietzsche or anyone whose cognition was meant to serve both anti-material (spiritual) and meta-rational ends.

Space Between as a gestalt ontological form in relation to America— an entity or self-subsistent “geist” which cannot be “decoyed” the way Nietzschean discourses can— because, especially in conjunction with *Dasein*, it creates a context of positivity in ontological space, and in the ontological space before active and action-oriented cognition; its commensurate active practice is (firstly) the pursuit, for individuals, of the development of “souled” consciousness— explorations of the processes in and “around” individuation, subjectivity, and difference— an open invitation to introspection, rather than a wild, easily misconstrued and manipulated construct of linguistic signs still steeped in the adolescent romanticism of the half-artistic and the half-philosophical.

Adam Fieled, 2013